

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 15-18 are pending in this application. Claim 7-9 are currently withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 15 are amended to address the teachings of Phillips and Morganti. Support for the amended claims may be found in the original specification at, for example, paragraphs [0031] and [0032], and Figures 1 and 2. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Afzali and Examiner Bryant at the interview held March 25, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,823,402 ("Phillips").

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,506 ("Morganti") or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Morganti in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,690,738 ("Boelkins").

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above rejections.

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly wherein the oiling roller has a porous formed body made of compressible material, wherein the compressible material extends from a roller shaft to an outside surface of the oiling roller, and wherein the oiling roller is in direct contact with the roller shaft through the entire length of the oiling roller, as required in claims 1 and 15.

Phillips

As shown in Figures 1-7 of Phillips, absorbent resilient material 38 (alleged compressible material) does not extend from the ^{axle}portion 22 (alleged roller shaft) to an outside surface of the conventional roller 10 (alleged oiling roller). Further, the absorbent material 38 (alleged compressible material) does not directly contact the ^{axle}portion 22 (alleged roller shaft) through an entire length of the conventional roller 10 (alleged oiling roller). Therefore, as agreed upon during the interview, Phillips fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 15, and dependent claims therefrom are patentable over the applied reference. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

Morganti and Boelkins

The Patent Office alleges that Morganti discloses a roller shaft wherein the roller shaft extends an entire length of the oiling roller and the oiling roller is mounted on the roller shaft at about which the oiling roller rotates.

However, even if this allegation is true, Morganti clearly fails to teach or suggest a compressible material that extends from a roller shaft to the outside surface of an oiling roller. In contrast, Morganti discloses a wick roller 31 (alleged oiling roller) that includes a ceramic core 41 that extends from a bore 43 (alleged roller shaft) to an outside surface of the wick roller 31. That is, the ceramic core 41 is clearly not a compressible material as required in claims 1 and 15. Therefore, as agreed upon during the interview, Morganti also fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature of claims 1 and 15.

Further, Boelkins discloses a perforated cylinder 50 closed by an end cap 54 (see Boelkins, Fig. 7). However, the perforated cylinder 50 of Boelkins is made of sheet metal having numerous perforations extendible through its peripheral wall and therefore, is not a

compressible material (see Boelkins, column 4, lines 41-48). As such, Boelkins fails to remedy the deficiencies of Morganti as Boelkins also fails to disclose or render obvious an oiling roller assembly wherein the oiling roller has a porous formed body made of compressible material, wherein the compressible material extends from a roller shaft to an outside surface of the oiling roller, and wherein the oiling roller is in direct contact with the roller shaft through the entire length of the oiling roller, as required in claims 1 and 15.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 15, and dependent claims therefrom, are patentable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Rejoinder

In response to the Restriction Requirement, claims 7-9 were withdrawn. However, in light of these withdrawn claims depending from claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that upon allowance of claim 1, claims 7-9 should be rejoined and similarly allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-9 and 15-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/can

Date: April 3, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
